DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 746 HE 000 881

By-Gordon, Edmund W.; Thomas, Charles L.
Brief: A Study on Compensatory Collegiate Programs for Minority Group Youth.
Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Teachers College.
Pub Date [69]
Note-16p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90
Descriptors-*Compensatory Education Programs, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Higher Education, Minority Groups, Remedial Programs, *Social Responsibility, *Special Programs

Universities are being faced with the problem of how they can best carry out their functions and pursue standards of academic excellence with youth who, because of social, economic and educational disadvantages, deviate markedly from traditional academic norms. Many institutions have initiated special programs or practices designed for these youth. These activities, such as modified admission policies, high school extension programs, tutorial programs, special recruitment, curriculum innovation, all aim to compensate for disadvantages of college aspirants. Because programs have multiplied, there is a pressing need to document and examine the developments. The study envisioned in this brief aims to compile data on existings programs and establish a rapid monitoring system to disseminate relevant information to institutions engaged in or planning similar programs. A second objective is to assess the effectiveness of existing programs and determine to what extent they have influenced the personal, social and academic adjustments of students and stimulated changes in institutional practice and attitudes. The brief outlines procedures to be used for the general survey intended to collect data from about 3000 institutions and kinds of information the researchers hope to learn from the questionnaires, personal interviews, and case studies of students and institutions. It is hoped the results will encourage further research, especially on the problem of identifying academic potential in minority group youth. The rationale for such an investigation is included. (JS)

ED028746

BRIEF:

A Study on Compensatory Collegiate Programs for Minority Group Youth

Edmund W. Gordon
Charles L. Thomas
Teachers College, Columbia University

As a consequence of formal recognition of the glaring inequities in opportunity to higher education and the pressing demands of a technologically advanced society, American colleges and universities have begun the task of making themselves more accessible to more youths -- regardless of race and socio-economic status.

Moving gradually from a position of elitism in the service of primarily white, middle and upper class youth to one of equality of educational opportunity has resulted in institutions of higher education being confronted with a basic problem that has plagued elementary and later, secondary schools for decades: how shall an educational institution best carry out its function with youth who, because of social, economic and educational restrictions, deviate so demonstrably from the traditional norms for which the institutions were historically designed? To add to the complexity of the problem, institutions of higher education yet must continue their pursuit of standards of academic excellence.

As a response to this problem many colleges and universities have initiated programs and/or practices designed specifically for youth who are unable to meet the traditional admission requirements. These programs and practices are attempts to somehow compensate for the social, economic, and educational disadvantages that these college aspirants presumably possess. Such activities as modified admission policies, tutorial programs, special recruitment, curriculum innovation, and fifth-year high school extension programs exemplify some of the efforts made by various colleges and universities throughout the country.

HE000 831

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Objectives of Study

In the last five years, compensatory programs and practices at the college level have rapidly expanded in terms of variety of programs and number of participating institutions. Subsequently, there has evolved a pressing need for documentation and examination of these fast-moving developments in higher education for the disadvantaged.

One of the main objectives of the study is to identify and examine the present status of such collegiate sponsored programs. Upon the compilation of data on existing programs, a rapid monitoring system will be established for the purpose of disseminating relevant information to institutions engaged in or planning to initiate compensatory programs in higher education.

A second but far more difficult objective will involve an assessment of the effectiveness of compensatory collegiate programs in attaining their respective goals. Such an effort will entail an analysis and evaluation of these programs for the purpose of ascertaining to what degree they have influenced the personal, social and academic adjustment of their recipients as well as changes in institutional practices and attitudes.

It is envisioned that data obtained from these two primary emphases will form the basis for later research regarding those variables which determine or influence the success or failure of these programs in meeting their objectives. Moreover, further research would be encouraged as a consequence of problems raised by the study. One such proposed researchable avenue is the search for and the examination of those institutional and student variables which may ultimately assist in the identification of academic potential in minority group youths.

Procedure

General Survey

A general survey is being conducted to collect data relevant to the present status of compensatory collegiate programs. All four-year colleges, community

colleges, and universities (approximately 3000 institutions) will receive questionnaires for the purpose of identifying, classifying and describing those institutions engaged in compensatory programs. The general survey is designed to determine:

(a) the objectives of the various programs as originally stated and as later redefined by the institution and participatory faculty;

(b) the extent and significance of the programs as perceived by the institution, faculty, and student participants;

(c) characteristics of participating students: qualifications, general background, attrition, aspirations, perceptions of themselves in relation to the program and the institution as a whole, etc.;

(d) characteristics of faculty participants: qualifications, amount of time committed to the program, degree of personal commitment, perceptions of participating students and program;

(e) nature of the institution: demographic features, size, academic standing, racial and social class composition of students, faculty and staff; acceptance rate of junior college students, definition of "high risk student," plans for modification or expansion of program, general attrition rate, and degree of cooperative involvement with other institutions;

(f) attitudes of other students, faculty, and staff toward program and participating students;

(g) attitudes of students, faculty, and staff toward transfer of junior college students;

(h) the structure of the programs and description of the processes developed for their operation: staffing, budget (also source of funds), specific innovations, special recruitment efforts, extent of financial assistance, etc.

Some of the factors outlined above cannot be adequately obtained by means of mailed questionnaires. As a result, visitations to selected colleges and

universities throughout the country will be made; the purpose being to conduct personal interviews among faculty, administration, and student participants as well as to observe the programs in operation.

Case Studies

In addition to the survey of all programs, approximately 12 - 15 in-depth case studies will be conducted. These will focus on individual students, groups of students, individual institutions, and groups of institutions. These studies will be both descriptive and comparative and will investigate in greater depth the factors outlined above as well as the following:

(a) institutional recruitment practices;

(b) institutional admissions procedures;

(c) remediation practices developed for the program;

(d) curricula developed for the program as well as curricula modified for regular use by participating students;

(e) extracurricular, academic and social functions;

(f) academic and social adjustment by participating students; and

(g) follow-up of students after they have dropped or graduated from the program.

In order to determine the impact of such programs upon student behavior and deviations in institutional practices and attitudes, several indices will be employed. Measures of academic achievement, social and attitudinal adjustment of students that have experienced the institutional innovations are some of the indices to be utilized. Examination of extra-curricular variables (e.g., student social patterns, student housing practices, school paper content trends) and community factors (e.g., racial attitude, open-housing acceptability, ethnic composition, etc.) should also provide valuable insight into those elements which may act as determinants to the success of these collegiate programs.

Reporting and Dissemination:

Published material on the work of this project will fall into 4 major categories:

1. periodic reports outlining the survey and descriptive data gathered;
2. periodic reports of trends as developed in the analysis of the descriptive data;
3. a directory of programs, including descriptive and analytic information; and
4. Reviews of related literature and ongoing research projects.

Dissemination can be handled through two established vehicles which have wide distribution among professional educators and the lay public concerned with educational issues. These vehicles are the College Entrance Examination Board "Review" and the ERIC/IRCD Bulletin. The latter is a bimonthly publication which will allot a special section if information from this project justifies it.

II

The Identification of College Potential in Minority Group Youth: A Proposed Rationale

One problem which will hopefully be researched as a consequence of the study on collegiate compensatory programs will be the structuring of a model which will facilitate the identification of college potential in disadvantaged youth. The success of such a model would greatly assist counselors and recruitment officials in their selection of students for regular and compensatory collegiate programs. Furthermore, it is visualized that it will encourage institutions to make more efforts in the prescription of learning experiences that will insure academic success for students who may differ qualitatively in intellectual functioning.

By definition, these youths have not demonstrated college potential by means of the two traditional criteria: high school average and standardized test scores. The underlying assumption of the proposed model is that the value of these indices of college potential can be enhanced by identifying those variables which characterize successful students participating in collegiate compensatory programs.

Furthermore, the examination of student x program interactions may provide insight into which types of programs appear to be more condusive for certain categories of students.

Student Variables as Correlates of Academic Achievement

High School Grades and Aptitude

As a general rule, selection procedures rely heavily on cumulative high school grade point averages and scores on various standardized achievement and aptitude tests. The latter measures are characterized by such tests as the Scholastic Aptitude Test of the College Entrance Examination Board and

the American College Testing Program.

Recent skepticism regarding the predictive validity of these traditional indices (Clark & Plotkin, 1964; Fishman et.al., 1964) in the selection of minority group youth -- particularly blacks -- has generated considerable research on the topic. There is evidence that general achievement and academic aptitude test scores (e.g., SAT and ACT) are as valid for predicting grades of blacks as for whites in both integrated and segregated colleges (Roberts, 1962; Hills et.al., 1963; Munday, 1965; Boney, 1966; Stanley & Porter, 1967; Cleary, 1968). These studies, however, were not concerned with criterion scores (i.e., college grades) that are obtained from atypical college programs as may be the case of many collegiate compensatory programs.

High school grades have traditionally been of more value in indicating the probable success in college than any other measure. However, recent studies have brought into question the validity of high school grades of black students (Funches, 1967; Thomas & Stanley, 1968). In many instances, SAT scores were found to be of more value in predicting college grades than that found when high school grades were used alone. Until the problem is resolved, it would seem that the best policy is to use both high school grades and test scores in selection procedures.

Non-Intellective Correlates of Achievement

The attrition rate of freshmen students has greatly disturbed many educators. Iffert (1957) estimated that less than 40% of entering freshmen graduate after normal progression through their institutions at first registration. This depressing finding has motivated researchers to investigate non-cognitive factors which may attribute to the success or failure of students.

Research findings have not been conclusive (and in many instances, conflicting) regarding the relationship between academic success and non-

intellective measures. Goodstein et.al. (1962) concluded from his study that although there were no identifiable measures of personality related to college success, there was enough relationship among measures to suggest the need for further research on non-intellective measures in relation to achievement.

Most of the studies have adhered to a cross sectional approach whereby achievers and non-achievers in college were psychometrically compared during the freshman year. Differences on personality variables between those who persist and those who withdraw have been indicated, for example, by use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Drasgow & McKenzie, 1958), and the Gough Adjective Check List (Heilbrun, 1962). Although there is general consensus as to the existence of such differences, there is no agreement regarding their specific nature (Hill, 1966).

general personality variables: Hoyt and Norman (1954) investigated the relationship between college GPA and the Ohio State Psychological Examination of students at three adjustment levels and found the correlation between college GPA and aptitude varied inversely with the number of MMPI clinical scales greater than 70. Watson (1967) advanced the premise that if indeed the relationship between aptitude and achievement actually does vary inversely with adjustment, there is one of two plausible explanations:

(a) aptitude and/or achievement measures are less reliable in maladjusted populations than among well-adjusted students; or

(b) non-intellective personality factors contribute more variance to college GPA in maladjusted populations than among normal groups.

Moreover, the study conducted by Watson tends to confirm Hoyt and Norman's earlier findings. However, it was also shown that use of the California Psychological Inventory added little to the prediction of academic success, particularly after aptitude was partialed out. It should be further noted that Anderson and Spencer (1963) provide contradictory findings to the Hoyt study.

motivation: Studies regarding motivational factors associated with academic effectiveness have also yielded fairly inconclusive results (Lavin, 1965). Katz (1968), reporting on his study on academic motivation, suggested that among low achievers, greater self-criticism and less favorable self-evaluation existed and that these factors tend to be generalized as acquired or secondary reinforcement for the reduction of anxiety levels. Studies have also been conducted to determine the relation of achievement between individuals who are socially motivated vs those who are academically motivated. Wyer (1968) presented evidence to refute the premise that these two forms of motivation are incompatible. Reed (1968) investigated the motivational impact of under-achieving college students' perceptions toward their college. Such students, he concluded, find low meaningfulness of daily college tasks, less warmth in interpersonal collegiate relations, and little relevance of college experiences to their future goals.

self concept: Probably more has been written on this factor than any other non-cognitive variable in recent years. The voluminous Coleman Report (1966) reported self concept as indicating a surprisingly strong correlation with test performance, especially for whites. This study appeared to echo the findings of earlier investigations (Bledsoe & Garrison, 1962; Taylor, 1964; Lourenso, 1965).

interpersonal variables: A factor related to the self concept is the effects of peer groups and authority figures on the behavior of students. Several studies have indicated that academic achievement is usually attended by peer group acceptance (Buswell, 1953; Muma, 1965), but whether academic achievement precedes or follows peer acceptance has not been established (Engle et.al., 1968). Engle et.al. (1968), investigating this question, supported the notion that acceptance by a peer model can have a positive effect on the scholastic performance of under-achievers. Two possible reasons for the positive influence of peer leaders were proposed: "the peer leader may have had an effect

equivalent to that of a personal tutor; and/or may have induced the underachievers to accept the ultimate value of a satisfactory scholastic record (p. 210).

fate control: Another non-intellective factor identified by Coleman as a correlate of test performance was "fate control" (indicated by means of a brief scale with such items as "Good luck is more important than hard work for success," to which the respondent possessing strong fate control would disagree). This factor appeared to be more important for performance of black students than for whites -- contributing at different grades from two to several times as much to the accounted-for variance of verbal achievement as that attributed to self concept and academic interest. Pettigrew (1968) and Katz (1968) emphasized the fact that this sense of internal control among blacks tends to be greater in desegregated schools.

Other factors that have been investigated in relation to achievement are: sociability and social acceptance (Mosier, 1937; Drought, 1938; Rosenberg, 1953; Burgess, 1956; Carew, 1957); emotional adjustment (Raphael, 1936; Mayo, 1957; Baymur, 1960; Powell, 1963; Anderson, 1963); and conformity (Brown, 1954; Erb, et.al., 1961). Except for conformity, studies on these factors revealed inconsistent findings. Coombs & Davies (1967) concluded that sociability or emotional adjustment are not significant factors in achievement. They suggested that conformity, motivation, and organizational effort may be more promising variables to consider as correlates of achievement.

In summary, many non-cognitive variables have been identified and researched regarding their relation to academic success. Most of the findings have been either inconclusive or conflicting. Moreover, very little research on these factors has been conducted on the population for which the model is proposed, i.e., the disadvantaged college student.

Proposed Rationale

Descriptive Data

Such measures of behavior as described above (intellective and non-cognitive) would be obtained on students participating in collegiate compensatory programs. Much of the data could be made available through the present study on collegiate compensatory programs (see part I). Some data may have to be collected independently of the current study.

To gain insight into non-standard patterns of achievement that may be relevant to college success, biographical information on individual students will be necessary (e.g., manifested interests in hobbies, organizational planning, etc., contribution to civic activities, leadership roles, responsibilities accepted in employment, special talents, etc.).

Design

The limitations of the cross sectional design in investigating these factors have been noted (Astin, 1964; Hill, 1966). Both a longitudinal and cross sectional approach could be undertaken to offset some of the inherent limitations of the latter approach.

As a consequence of obtaining data in the longitudinal phase, it should be possible to classify the students into a two-factor analysis: sex (two levels) x academic status (three levels). The classification can be conceptualized by:

		Sex	
		Male	Female
Academic Status	achievers		
	non-achievers		
	voluntary withdrawal[a]		

a = non academic reasons for dropping from the program (e.g., death in family, to seek employment to assist family, etc.)

The lack of making distinctions between types of dropouts and sex differences has confounded the conclusions drawn in many studies (Hill, 1966).

The analysis in this 2 x 3 classification format would enable the researchers to identify the main and interaction effects of intellective and non-cognitive variables which may characterize students in each category.

Facilities & Model Construction

It is visualized that the establishment of regional centers to actively participate in the on-going operations of the study would greatly facilitate its progress. Furthermore, such centers would assist in the structuring of the model and the dissemination of relevant information to interested institutions.

References

Anderson, L. B. & Spencer, P. A. Personal adjustment and academic predictability among college freshmen. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1963, 47, 79-100.

Astin, A. W. Personal and environmental factors associated with college dropouts among high aptitude students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1964, 45, 219-227.

Baymur, F. B. & Patterson, C. H. A comparison of three methods of assisting under-achieving high school students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 83-88.

Bledsoe, J. C. & Garrison, K. C. The self concepts of elementary school children in relation to their academic achievement, intelligence, interests, and manifest anxiety. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project #1008, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1962.

Boney, J. D. Predicting the academic achievement of secondary school Negro students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 700-703.

Brown, W. F., Abeles, N., & Iscoe, I. "Motivational difference between high and low scholarship students." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1954, 45, 215-223.

Burgess, E. Personality factors of over- and under-achievers in engineering. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, 89-99.

Buswell, M. M. The relationship between the social structure of the classroom and the academic success of pupils. Journal of Experimental Education, 1953, 23, 37-52.

Carew, D. K. A comparison of activities, social acceptance and scholastic achievement of men students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1957, 36, 121-124.

Clark, K. B. & Plotkin, L. The Negro student at integrated colleges, New York: National Scholarship Services and Fund for Negro Students, 1964.

Cleary, T. A. Test bias: prediction of grades of Negro and white students in integrated colleges. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1968, 5, 115-124.

Coleman, J. S. et.al. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coombs, R. H. & Davies, V. Socio-psychological adjustment in collegiate scholastic success. Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 61, 186-187.

Drasgow, J. & McKenzie, J. College transcripts, graduation, and the MMPI. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1958, 5, 196-199.

Drought, N. E. "An analysis of eight measures of personality adjustment in relation to relative scholastic achievement." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1938, 22, 597-606.

Engle, K. B., Davis, D. A., & Muzer, G. E. Interpersonal effects on underachievers. Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 61, 218-210.

Erb, E. D. Conformity and achievement in college. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1961, 39, 361-366.

Fishman, J. A., Deutsch, M., Kogan, L., North, R., & Whitman, M. Guidelines for testing minority group children. Journal of Social Issues Supplement, 1964, 20, 129-145.

Funches, D. Correlations between secondary school transcript averages and grade-point averages and between ACT scores and grade-point averages of freshmen at Jackson State College. College and University, 1967, 43, 52-54.

Goodstein, L. D., Crites, J. O. & Heilbrun, A. B. Personality correlates of academic adjustment. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project #805, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Health, Education and Welfare, 1962.

Heilbrun, A. B. Prediction of first year college drop-outs using ACL need scales. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 11, 58-63.

Hill, A. A longitudinal study of attrition among high aptitude college students. Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 60, 166-173.

Hills, J. R., Kloch, J. C., & Lewis, S. Freshman norms for the university system of Georgia, 1960-1962, Atlanta, Ga.: Office of Testing and Guidance, Regents of the University System of Georgia, 1963.

Hoyt, D. P. & Norman, W. T. Adjustment and academic predictability. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 84-87.

Iffert, R. E. Retention and withdrawal of college students, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957.

Katz, I. Academic motivation and equal educational opportunity. Harvard Educational Review, 1968, 38, 57-65.

Lavin, D. E. The prediction of academic performance. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

Lourenso, S. V., Greenberg, J. W., & Davidson, H. H. Personality characteristics revealed in drawings of deprived children who differ in school achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 1965, 59, 63-67.

Mayo, G. D. Differentiating characteristics of a group of students having psychological problems. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1957, 48, 359-370.

Mosier, C. I. Factors influencing the validity of a scholastic interest scale. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1937, 28, 188-196.

Muma, J. R. Peer evaluation and academic performance. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 405-409.

Munday, L. A. Predicting college grades in predominantly Negro colleges. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1965, 2, 157-160.

Pettigrew, T. F. Race and equal educational opportunity. Harvard Educational Review, 1968, 38, 66-76.

Powell, W. J. & Jourard, S. M. Some objective evidence of immaturity in underachieving college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 276-282.

Raphael, T. Four years of student mental hygiene work at the University of Michigan. Mental Hygiene, 1936, 20, 218-231.

Reed, H. B. College students' motivations related to voluntary dropout and under-overachievement. Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 61, 413-416.

Roberts, S. O. Studies in identification of college potential. Nashville, Tennessee: Department of Psychology, Fisk University, 1962 (mimeographed).

Rosenberg, L. A., McHenry, T. B., & Rosenberg, A. M. Sociometric ratings as predictors of academic performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1953, 21, 441-456.

Stanley, J. C. & Porter, A. C. Correlation of scholastic aptitude test scores with college grades for Negroes versus whites. Journal of Educational Measurement, Winter, 1967, 4, 199-218.

Taylor, R. G. Personality traits and descrepant achievement: a review. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 76-82.

Thomas, C. L. & Stanley, J. C. Effectiveness of high school grades for predicting college grades of Negro students: an exploratory study. New York: Department of Guidance, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968 (mimeographed).

Watson, C. G. The California Psychological Inventory as a predictor of academic achievement in normal and maladjusted college males. Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 61, 10-13.

Wyer, R. S. Behavioral correlates of academic achievement II. pursuit of individual versus group goals in a decision making task. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1968, 59, 74-81.